

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed June 6, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his time in conducting a telephone interview and reviewing proposed claims. Applicant has amended the claims as proposed, and as was suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 10, 15, and 22 are amended. Therefore, claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being Indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3 to clarify the terminology being used. With respect to claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that the term data is plural. Therefore, the phrase "data in the storage module" has proper antecedent basis. The storage module is claimed in claim 1, and data is a plural term, which therefore does not need the indefinite article of a/an. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,447 issued to Cannon, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,621 issued to Heie. Cannon discusses a pager associated with a server running "agent" software that can retrieve predetermined information from the Web, reformat it, and push it onto the pager to take advantage of low cost non-real time transmissions. Heie discusses data entry system that can expand text shortcuts in order to minimize typing on a cell phone keypad. Cannon and Heie do not make claim 1, as amended, obvious.

Claim 1, as amended, includes the limitation of "identifying an automatically substituted code in the response data, the identifying an automatically substituted code in the response data, the automatically substituted code inserted into the data by the server to reduce a size of the response data;" (emphasis added). Cannon does not teach or suggest automatic substitution of codes. Heie does not teach or suggest the use of a server, to substitute codes to reduce the size of the response data. Rather, Heie uses code substitution, known by the user, to reduce the amount of typing required. There is no teaching or suggestion in the references to have automatically substituted code in the response data inserted by the server to reduce a size of the response data. Therefore, claim 1, and claims 2-9 which depend on it, are not obvious over Cannon in view of Heie.

The Examiner further rejected claims depending on Independent claim 1, as follows. Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,447 issued to Cannon, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,621 issued to Heie and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,839 issued to Davani. Examiner rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,447 issued to Cannon, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,621 issued to Heie and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,060 issued to Schroeder, et al. None of these additional references cure the shortcomings of Cannon in view of Heie as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 1-9 are patentable in view of the above references.

Examiner rejected claims 10, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,673,322 issued to Pepe, et al. in view of Heie.

Pepe discusses a proxy server with a protocol translator between the Web and a high latency wireless device. Heie, as discussed above, discusses data entry system that can expand text shortcuts in order to minimize typing on a cell phone keypad.

Neither Pepe nor Heie make claim 10, as amended obvious. Claim 10, as amended, recites in part "a substitution logic to automatically replace a term in the response data with a code, the automatically substituted code reducing a size of the response data." Neither Pepe nor Heie teach or suggest such a substitution. Therefore, claim 10, and claims 11-14 which depend on it, are not obvious over Pepe in view of Heie.

Claim 15, as amended recites in part "a substitution logic for detecting the codes in the formatted data and substituting the associated data elements for each of the codes, to recreate the original data." In Heie, the "original data" is not recreated for display. Rather, the point of Heie is to enable the user to type a short code, instead of typing out the long phrase. In Heie, the short code is replaced by the phrase that is associated by it, which modifies the original data. In contrast, the present invention substitutes the associated data elements to recreate original data. Therefore, claim 15, and claims 16-21 which depend on it are not obvious over or anticipated by the combination of Pepe and Heie.

Claim 22, as amended, recites in part "the second device to automatically substitute a code for a data element prior to sending the data to the first device with a code whereby the bandwidth used for transmitting the data to the first device is reduced. As discussed above, this is not the purpose, nor the function of Heie. Therefore, claim 22 is not obvious over Pepe in view of Heie.

The Examiner further rejected claims depending on Independent claims 10, 15, and 22 as follows. Examiner rejected claims 11-13, 20, 21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,673,322 issued to Pepe, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,621 issued to Heie and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,405,060 issued to Schroeder, et al. Examiner rejected claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,673,322 issued to Pepe, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,621 issued to Heie and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,448,765 issued to Kovanen, et al. None of these additional references cure the shortcomings of Pepe in view of Heie as discussed above. Therefore, claims 10-24 are patentable in view of the above references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested.


If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Judith A. Szepesi at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

10/7/04


Judith A. Szepesi
Reg. No, 39,393

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 720-8300